Table D-11a. Law Enforcement Projects by County

—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007^^											
County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of Total Cost	Percent Cost in CIP		ost Per Capita					
Bledsoe	2	\$ 13,150,000	1.8%	0.0%	\$	1,051					
Blount	1	4,000,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$	37					
Bradley	4	22,462,000	3.1%	88.4%	\$	253					
Campbell	1	8,000,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	200					
Carter	1	2,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	35					
Cheatham	2	2,500,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	68					
Chester	$\frac{1}{1}$	2,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	127					
Claiborne	2	12,500,000	1.7%	0.0%	\$	415					
Cocke	1	3,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	89					
Coffee	4	30,360,000	4.2%	0.0%	\$	624					
Cumberland	1	90,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	2					
Davidson	24	232,626,000	32.1%	82.3%	\$	411					
Decatur	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	9					
Dickson	2	7,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	160					
Dyer	2	8,660,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$	233					
Fayette	2	13,590,000	1.9%	95.7%	\$	445					
Fentress	1	2,500,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	149					
Franklin	3	2,750,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	69					
Gibson	2	600,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	12					
Grainger	2	5,050,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	241					
Greene	1	2,000,000	0.7 %	100.0%	\$	32					
Hamblen		700,000	0.5%	100.0%	\$	12					
Hamilton	6	13,093,530	1.8%	0.0%	\$	43					
Hardeman		2,000,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$	71					
Hardin	2	7,080,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$	275					
Hawkins	2	1,350,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	25					
Haywood		2,000,000	0.2 %	100.0%	\$	101					
Henderson	2	900,000	0.3%	88.9%	\$	35					
Hickman	5	11,145,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$	490					
Jackson	1	5,500,000	0.8%	100.0%	Ф \$	490					
Jefferson	6		1.8%	0.8%	\$	493 291					
	3	13,110,000 8,145,000	1.0%	0.0%	э \$	462					
Johnson Knox	4	56,734,638	7.8%	100.0%	\$	147					
Lauderdale	1	370,000	0.1%			147					
Lawrence	2	19,519,989	2.7%	0.0%	\$	488					
	1	3,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	Ф \$	466 75					
Loudon McMinn	4	6,740,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	135					
Marion	1	85,000	0.9%	0.0%	Ф \$	3					
					\$						
Marshall	2 3	2,900,000	0.4%	0.0%		107					
Maury	2	3,849,700	0.5%	76.6%	\$	55					
Monroe	5	371,000	0.1%	48.2% 17.1%	\$	9					
Montgomery		1,460,000	0.2%		\$	11					
Morgan	1	1,200,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	60					
Obion	1	1,000,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	31					
Perry	2	3,150,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	420					
Pickett	1	5,000,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$	990					
Polk	1	1,250,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	77					
Putnam	1	50,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$	1					

Table D-11a. (continued)

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	C	ost Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	(Capita
Rhea	1	5,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	175
Roane	1	5,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$	96
Robertson	1	1,300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	23
Rutherford	2	850,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	4
Sevier	5	2,549,754	0.4%	31.8%	\$	35
Shelby	29	104,640,868	14.4%	99.0%	\$	117
Smith	2	7,650,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$	425
Stewart	1	3,000,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$	237
Sullivan	2	7,725,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$	51
Sumner	2	1,200,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	9
Union	1	2,500,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$	136
Van Buren	1	7,900,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$	1,442
Warren	1	14,000,000	1.9%	100.0%	\$	363
Washington	3	7,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$	65
Wayne	1	1,200,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$	71
White	1	250,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$	11
Williamson	5	3,210,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$	24
Wilson	2	3,697,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$	40
Statewide	1	425,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$	9
Statewide Total	184		100.0%	63.0%	\$	128

^{*} Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

^{**}Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-11b. Law Enforcement Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual				Plannin	Planning & Design		Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in r	nillions]	Nu	ımber	Cost [in m	nillions]
Bledsoe	1	50.0%	\$ 3.2	24.0%	1	50.0%	\$ 10.0	76.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Blount	1	100.0%	4.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bradley	1	25.0%	0.3	1.4%	2	50.0%	9.7	43.0%	1	25.0%	12.5	55.6%
Campbell	1	100.0%	8.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carter	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	2	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chester	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Claiborne	2	100.0%	12.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cocke	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	4	100.0%	30.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	11	45.8%	41.2	17.7%	9	37.5%	158.7	68.2%	4	16.7%	32.7	14.1%
Decatur	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dickson	1	50.0%	1.0	14.3%	1	50.0%	6.0	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dyer	1	50.0%	0.2	1.8%	1	50.0%	8.5	98.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fayette	2	100.0%	13.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	3	100.0%	2.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gibson	2	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grainger	2	100.0%	5.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greene	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	3	50.0%	1.2	9.3%	3	50.0%	11.9	90.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardin	1	50.0%	0.1	1.1%	1	50.0%	7.0	98.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	1	50.0%	0.3	18.5%	1	50.0%	1.1	81.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Henderson	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hickman	5	100.0%	11.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	1	100.0%	5.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	5	83.3%		99.2%	1	16.7%	0.1	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	2	66.7%		26.3%	1	33.3%	6.0	73.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	50.0%		15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	48.0	84.6%
Lauderdale	1	100.0%		100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence	2	100.0%	19.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table D-11b. (continued)

	Conceptual				Planning & Design			Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nι	ımber	Cost [in r	millions]	Nu	ımber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	4	100.0%	6.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marion	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marshall	2	100.0%	2.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Maury	2	66.7%	2.9	75.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.9	24.7%
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	51.8%	1	50.0%	0.2	48.2%
Montgomery	3	60.0%	1.2	82.9%	2	40.0%	0.3	17.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Morgan	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obion	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Perry	2	100.0%	3.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pickett	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rhea	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%
Rutherford	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sevier	5	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	6	20.7%	7.7	7.3%	16	55.2%	34.1	32.6%	7	24.1%	62.8	60.0%
Smith	1	50.0%	7.5	98.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Stewart	1	100.0%	3.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sullivan	2	100.0%	7.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sumner	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	16.7%	1	50.0%	1.0	83.3%
Union	1	100.0%	2.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Van Buren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	7.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	14.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	2	66.7%	5.5	78.6%	1	33.3%	1.5	21.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wayne	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
White	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	3	60.0%	2.4	75.1%	2	40.0%	0.8	24.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wilson	2	100.0%	3.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Regional	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	113	61.4%	\$ 271.2	37.4%	53	28.8%	\$ 295.0	40.7%	18	9.8%	\$ 159.5	22.0%

^{*} Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-12a. Storm Water Projects by County

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	Cost Per
County	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	Cost in CIP	Capita
Anderson	2	\$ 2,000,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 28
Blount	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 0
Bradley	2	5,010,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$ 56
Campbell	1	1,000,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 25
Carroll	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 3
Carter	1	500,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 9
Cheatham	1	600,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 16
Coffee	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 2
Cumberland	1	300,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 6
Davidson	39	176,711,000	42.5%	100.0%	\$ 313
Decatur	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 21
Franklin	2	1,420,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 36
Greene	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 8
Hamblen	1	900,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 15
Hamilton	9	51,260,000	12.3%	100.0%	\$ 167
Haywood	2	400,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 20
Jefferson	2	650,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 14
Johnson	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 3
Knox	4	18,098,800	4.3%	100.0%	\$ 47
Lawrence	2	5,022,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$ 126
Loudon	2	1,320,000	0.3%	94.7%	\$ 33
McMinn	3	1,535,000	0.4%	8.8%	\$ 31
McNairy	2	2,100,000	0.5%	38.1%	\$ 85
Madison	1	300,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 3
Maury	2	1,110,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 16
Montgomery	4	6,457,500	1.6%	100.0%	\$ 48
Morgan	1	1,000,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 50
Obion	2	200,000	0.0%	25.0%	\$ 6
Polk	1	500,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 31
Putnam	1	50,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 1
Robertson	2	1,363,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 24
Rutherford	1	250,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 1
Shelby	25	106,684,685	25.6%	100.0%	\$ 119
Sullivan	3	540,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 4
Sumner	2	1,330,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 10
Unicoi	1	5,000,000	1.2%	0.0%	\$ 282
Washington	2	6,400,000	1.5%	85.9%	\$ 59
Wayne	1	250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 15
Weakley	1	1,000,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 29
Williamson	9	13,810,000	3.3%	96.4%	\$ 103
Statewide	141	\$ 416,121,985	100.0%	93.9%	

^{*} Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

^{**}Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-12b. Storm Water Projects by County and by Stage of Development

		Conceptual				Planning	& Design		Construction			
County	Nur	nber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nui	nber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	1	50.0%	\$ 1.0	50.0%	1	50.0%	\$ 1.0	50.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%
Blount	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bradley	1	50.0%	1.5	29.9%	1	50.0%	3.5	70.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Carter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Coffee	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	1	2.6%	6.5	3.7%	22	56.4%	27.3	15.5%	16	41.0%	142.9	80.9%
Decatur	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Franklin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.4	29.6%	1	50.0%	1.0	70.4%
Greene	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamblen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	4	44.4%	2.9	5.6%	4	44.4%	38.4	74.9%	1	11.1%	10.0	19.5%
Haywood	1	50.0%	0.2	37.5%	1	50.0%	0.3	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jefferson	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	2	50.0%	15.1	83.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	3.0	16.8%
Lawrence	2	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Loudon	1	50.0%	1.3	94.7%	1	50.0%	0.1	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	1	33.3%	0.1	4.9%	2	66.7%	1.5	95.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McNairy	1	50.0%	1.3	61.9%	1	50.0%	0.8	38.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Madison	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4.7	72.0%	2	50.0%	1.8	28.0%
Morgan	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Obion	1	50.0%	0.1	25.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	1.4	100.0%
Rutherford	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%

Table D-12b. (continued)

		Conc	eptual			Planning	& Design			Cons	truction	
County	Nun	nber	Cost [in	millions]	Nur	nber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nun	nber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Shelby	5	20.0%	2.1	2.0%	7	28.0%	3.9	3.7%	13	52.0%	100.7	94.4%
Sullivan	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0.3	60.2%	1	33.3%	0.2	39.8%
Sumner	1	50.0%	1.0	75.2%	1	50.0%	0.3	24.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unicoi	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	6.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wayne	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Weakley	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	4	44.4%	2.7	19.6%	3	33.3%	9.4	67.8%	2	22.2%	1.8	12.7%
Statewide	40	28.4%	\$ 50.8	12.2%	58	41.1%	\$ 102.0	24.5%	43	30.5%	\$ 263.4	63.3%

^{*} Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-13a. Solid Waste Projects by County

County	Number of	Total Estimated	Percent of	Percent	st Per
	Projects	Cost		Cost in CIP	apita
Anderson	1	2,000,000	1.0%	0.0%	\$ 28
Bedford	2	450,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 12
Bledsoe	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 4
Campbell	1	1,100,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 27
Cannon	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 8
Carter	1	60,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 1
Cheatham	1	100,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 3
Cumberland	2	115,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 2
Davidson	8	16,206,000	7.7%	100.0%	\$ 29
Fayette	1	1,300,000	0.6%	100.0%	\$ 43
Fentress	2	105,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 6
Hamilton	3	7,015,000	3.3%	100.0%	\$ 23
Hardeman	2	875,000	0.4%	100.0%	\$ 31
Hawkins	3	410,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 8
Haywood	1	50,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 3
Henderson	1	90,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 3
Houston	1	100,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 13
Jackson	1	50,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 4
Knox	3	4,105,000	2.0%	100.0%	\$ 11
McMinn	1	150,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 3
Macon	1	80,000	0.0%	100.0%	\$ 4
Maury	1	120,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 2
Meigs	1	250,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 22
Monroe	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 1
Montgomery	2	300,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 2
Overton	1	1,500,000	0.7%	100.0%	\$ 74
Putnam	3	275,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 4
Roane	2	245,000	0.1%	51.0%	\$ 5
Robertson	1	75,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 1
Scott	1	500,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 23
Shelby	15	146,567,037	69.8%	100.0%	\$ 164
Smith	2	2,090,000	1.0%	4.3%	\$ 116
Sullivan	3	1,098,000	0.5%	36.4%	\$ 7
Sumner	4	8,800,000	4.2%	0.0%	\$ 66
Warren	2	665,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 17
Washington	3	1,375,000	0.7%	14.5%	\$ 13
Williamson	9	10,970,000	5.2%	81.1%	\$ 82
Wilson	2	600,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 7
Statewide	91	\$ 209,991,037	100.0%	90.1%	\$ 37

^{*} Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

^{**}Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-13b. Solid Waste Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual				Plannin	g & Desig	n	Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Νι	ımber	Cost [in r	nillions]
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%	\$ 2.0	100.0%
Bedford	2	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Bledsoe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Campbell	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cannon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Carter	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cheatham	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Cumberland	2	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Davidson	1	12.5%	1.2	7.4%	2	25.0%	3.2	19.7%	5	62.5%	11.8	72.8%
Fayette	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fentress	2	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hamilton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hardeman	1	50.0%	0.8	85.7%	1	50.0%	0.1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hawkins	3	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Henderson	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Houston	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jackson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Knox	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	4.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McMinn	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Macon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%
Meigs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%
Overton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Putnam	3	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Roane	2	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Shelby	1	6.7%	3.0	2.0%	8	53.3%	54.7	37.3%	6	40.0%	88.9	60.6%
Smith	2	100.0%	2.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-13b. (continued)

		Conceptual				Plannin	g & Desig	n	Construction			
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in i	nillions]
Sullivan	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sumner	4	100.0%	8.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warren	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Washington	3	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Williamson	2	22.2%	3.8	35.1%	5	55.6%	3.8	34.9%	2	22.2%	3.3	30.1%
Wilson	2	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Statewide	36	39.6%	\$ 24.3	11.6%	35	38.5%	\$ 79.0	37.6%	20	22.0%	\$ 106.6	50.8%

^{*} Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-14a. Fire Protection Projects by County

County Number of Projects Total Estimated Cost Percent of Cost in CIP Total Cost Cost in CIP Capita Anderson 2 \$ 2,750,000 2.0% 72.7% 38 Bedford 1 550,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 14 Blount 3 417,000 0.3% 48.0% \$ 4 Bradlev 4 1,068,000 0.8% 19.4% \$ 12 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 33 Chester 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 33 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 111 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% 44 Decatur 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.0% \$ 25		Number of	Total Catimated	Dorsont of	Danaant	Coot Don
Anderson 2 \$ 2,750,000 2.0% 72.7% \$ 38 Bedford 1 550,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 14 Blount 3 417,000 0.3% 48.0% \$ 4 Bradley 4 1,068,000 0.8% 19.4% \$ 12 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 13 Cheater 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 1,200,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 25 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% \$ 6.4% \$ 18 <td< th=""><th>County</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></td<>	County					
Bedford 1 550,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 14 Blount 3 417,000 0.3% 48.0% \$ 4 Bradley 4 1,068,000 0.8% 19.4% \$ 12 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 33 Chester 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 33 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100,0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100,0% \$ 34 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34	Anderson					
Blount 3						
Bradley 4 1,068,000 0.8% 19.4% \$ 12 Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 30 Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 13 Chester 1 500,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 25 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 23		•				
Campbell 2 400,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 10 Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 3 Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 13 Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75,6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 95 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>						
Carroll 1 76,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 3 Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 13 Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 45.6% \$ 44 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$						
Carter 2 732,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 13 Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 25 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15						
Cheatham 4 1,435,000 1.0% 75.6% \$ 39 Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hamilton 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 15						
Chester 1 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 32 Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 15 <						
Cumberland 1 1,200,000 0.9% 100.0% \$ 25 Davidson 11 24,830,000 18.0% 45.6% \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 95 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17						
Davidson Decatur 11 24,830,000 do. 18.0% do. 45.6% ships \$ 44 Decatur 2 400,000 do. 0.3% do. 37.5% ships 34 Dyer 2 900,000 do. 0.7% do. 100.0% ships 24 Fayette 3 550,000 do. 0.4% do. 36.4% ships 18 Giles 1 750,000 do. 0.5% do. 0.0% ships 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 do. 0.7% do. 0.0% ships 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 do. 4.4% do. 0.0% ships 95 Grundy 1 325,000 do. 0.2% do. 100.0% ships 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 do. 0.4% do. 0.0% ships 15 Hamblen 2 4,600,000 do. 3.3% do. 0.0% ships 15 Hamblen 3 475,000 do. 0.5% do. 0.0% ships 15 Handerban 3 475,000 do. 0.3% do. 68.4% ships 17 Haywo						
Decatur 2 400,000 0.3% 37.5% \$ 34 Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Harcock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 11 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Henderson </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Dyer 2 900,000 0.7% 100.0% \$ 24 Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 11 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawbins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson<						
Fayette 3 550,000 0.4% 36.4% \$ 18 Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 15 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Knox </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Giles 1 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 25 Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 John	•					
Grainger 1 1,000,000 0.7% 0.0% \$ 48 Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 22 John						
Greene 4 6,000,000 4.4% 0.0% \$ 95 Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 50.0% \$ 28 Knox<						
Grundy 1 325,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 23 Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 50.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 28 Knox<		·				
Hamblen 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 9 Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$						
Hamilton 2 4,600,000 3.3% 0.0% \$ 15 Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 1,530,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 38 <td< td=""><td>•</td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	•	1				
Hancock 2 750,000 0.5% 0.0% \$ 111 Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 1,530,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 M		•				
Hardeman 3 475,000 0.3% 68.4% \$ 17 Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>						
Hawkins 4 1,211,500 0.9% 0.0% \$ 22 Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Mar						
Haywood 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 15 Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Mar						
Henderson 2 325,000 0.2% 53.8% \$ 13 Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Mon	Hawkins	4				
Houston 1 280,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 35 Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgom		·				
Jefferson 1 100,000 0.1% 100.0% \$ 2 Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5	Henderson	2	325,000			
Johnson 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% 28 Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% 313 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.4% 100.0% 5 Putnam 2 <td>Houston</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Houston	1				
Knox 2 1,650,000 1.2% 100.0% \$ 4 Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Jefferson	1	100,000		100.0%	
Lauderdale 1 300,000 0.2% 100.0% \$ 11 Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Johnson		500,000			
Lawrence 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 12 Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Knox	2	1,650,000	1.2%	100.0%	\$ 4
Lincoln 1 300,000 0.2% 0.0% \$ 9 Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Lauderdale	1	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 11
Loudon 1 1,530,000 1.1% 100.0% \$ 38 McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Lawrence	1	500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 12
McMinn 2 1,750,000 1.3% 0.0% \$ 35 McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Lincoln	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	
McNairy 8 785,000 0.6% 31.8% \$ 32 Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Loudon	1	1,530,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$ 38
Marshall 1 375,000 0.3% 0.0% \$ 14 Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	McMinn	2	1,750,000	1.3%	0.0%	\$ 35
Maury 4 1,975,000 1.4% 50.6% \$ 28 Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	McNairy	8	785,000	0.6%	31.8%	\$ 32
Monroe 1 500,000 0.4% 0.0% \$ 13 Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Marshall	1	375,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 14
Montgomery 8 11,350,000 8.2% 100.0% \$ 84 Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Maury	4	1,975,000	1.4%	50.6%	\$ 28
Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8	Monroe	1	500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 13
Obion 1 150,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 5 Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8						
Putnam 2 500,000 0.4% 100.0% \$ 8						
rknea 1 250.0001 0.2%1 0.0%1\$ 9!	Rhea	1	250,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 9
Roane 1 100,000 0.1% 0.0% \$ 2						
Robertson 5 2,185,000 1.6% 68.6% \$ 39						

Table D-14a. (continued)

County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of Total Cost	Percent Cost in CIP	Cost Per Capita
Rutherford	1	1,385,000	1.0%	100.0%	\$ 7
Scott	1	50,000	0.0%	0.0%	\$ 2
Sevier	4	3,095,000	2.2%	100.0%	\$ 42
Shelby	11	24,841,558	18.1%	100.0%	\$ 28
Stewart	1	790,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 62
Sullivan	3	2,080,000	1.5%	100.0%	\$ 14
Sumner	6	8,080,000	5.9%	0.0%	\$ 60
Tipton	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 6
Unicoi	4	1,070,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$ 60
Warren	1	350,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 9
Washington	9	5,435,000	3.9%	63.2%	\$ 50
Wayne	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 12
Weakley	2	1,300,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$ 38
Williamson	14	10,025,000	7.3%	72.7%	\$ 75
Wilson	2	1,500,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 16
Statewide	165	\$ 137,626,058	100.0%	57.6%	\$ 24

^{*} Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

^{**}Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-14b. Fire Protection Projects by County and by Stage of Development

	Conceptual						g & Desig		Construction				
County	Nu	mber	er Cost [in millions]		Nu	Number (Cost [in millions]		Number		nillions]	
Anderson	1	50.0%	\$ 2.0	72.7%	1	50.0%	\$ 0.8	27.3%	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	
Bedford	1	100.0%	0.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Blount	2	66.7%	0.3	64.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0.2	36.0%	
Bradley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Campbell	1	50.0%	0.2	50.0%	1	50.0%	0.2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Carroll	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Carter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	
Cheatham	1	25.0%	0.3	17.4%	1	25.0%	0.1	7.0%	2	50.0%	1.1	75.6%	
Chester	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cumberland	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	
Davidson	1	9.1%	1.8	7.0%	7	63.6%	18.6	75.0%	3	27.3%	4.5	17.9%	
Decatur	1	50.0%	0.3	62.5%	1	50.0%	0.2	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Dyer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Fayette	1	33.3%	0.2	36.4%	2	66.7%	0.4	63.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Giles	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Grainger	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Greene	4	100.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Grundy	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hamblen	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hamilton	1	50.0%	0.4	8.7%	1	50.0%	4.2	91.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hancock	1	50.0%	0.3	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.5	66.7%	
Hardeman	1	33.3%	0.3	52.6%	2	66.7%	0.2	47.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hawkins	2	50.0%	0.8	68.1%	2	50.0%	0.4	31.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Haywood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	
Henderson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Houston	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Jefferson	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Johnson	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Knox	2	100.0%	1.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lauderdale	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lawrence	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lincoln	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Loudon	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
McMinn	1	50.0%	1.5	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	14.3%	
McNairy	4	50.0%	0.5	60.5%	4	50.0%	0.3	39.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	

Table D-14b. (continued)

	Conceptual					Planning	g & Desig	n	Construction				
County	Nu	mber	Cost [in i	millions]	Nu	mber	Cost [in	millions]	Nui	mber	Cost [in	millions]	
Marshall	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Maury	3	75.0%	1.3	64.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0.7	35.4%	
Monroe	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Montgomery	5	62.5%	8.7	76.2%	2	25.0%	2.2	19.4%	1	12.5%	0.5	4.4%	
Obion	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Putnam	1	50.0%	0.3	50.0%	1	50.0%	0.3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rhea	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Roane	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Robertson	4	80.0%	1.4	63.4%	1	20.0%	0.8	36.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rutherford	1	100.0%	1.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Scott	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sevier	3	75.0%	2.6	84.0%	1	25.0%	0.5	16.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Shelby	1	9.1%	1.0	4.0%	6	54.5%	12.6	50.8%	4	36.4%	11.2	45.2%	
Stewart	1	100.0%	0.8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	1	33.3%	0.9	45.2%	2	66.7%	1.1	54.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sumner	4	66.7%	6.5	80.2%	2	33.3%	1.6	19.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Tipton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unicoi	2	50.0%	0.2	15.9%	1	25.0%	0.5	46.7%	1	25.0%	0.4	37.4%	
Warren	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Washington	6	66.7%	4.3	79.1%	2	22.2%	0.2	4.3%	1	11.1%	0.9	16.6%	
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	
Weakley	2	100.0%	1.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Williamson	12	85.7%	7.4	73.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	2.7	26.7%	
Wilson	1	50.0%	1.0	66.7%	1	50.0%	0.5	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	90	54.5%	\$ 63.4	46.1%	52	31.5%	\$ 49.0	35.6%	23	13.9%	\$ 25.3	18.4%	

^{*} Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Table D-15a. Public Health Facility Projects by County

		-	_		
County	Number of Projects	Total Estimated Cost	Percent of Total Cost	Percent Cost in CIP	st Per apita
Anderson	1	\$ 1,500,000	1.1%	0.0%	\$ 21
Bledsoe		1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 80
Cannon	2	210,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 16
Chester	1	1,500,000	1.1%	100.0%	\$ 95
Claiborne	1	6,000,000	4.4%	0.0%	\$ 199
Coffee		500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 10
Cumberland	2	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 6
Davidson	10	3,932,000	2.9%	68.2%	\$ 7
Greene	3	920,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 15
Grundy	1	240,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 17
Hamilton	l ;	675,000	0.5%	0.0%	\$ 2
Hancock	l ;	5,000,000	3.7%	0.0%	\$ 739
Hardin	1	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 12
Henderson	1	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 12
Hickman	1	400,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 18
Knox	2	910,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 2
Lauderdale	1	1,200,000	0.9%	0.0%	\$ 44
Lewis	1	350,000	0.3%	0.0%	\$ 31
Lincoln	1	18,000,000	13.3%	0.0%	\$ 569
Loudon	1	1,100,000	0.8%	0.0%	\$ 27
Madison	2	12,400,000	9.1%	80.6%	\$ 134
Maury	1	2,000,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$ 28
Monroe	1	1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 25
Montgomery	3	5,100,000	3.8%	100.0%	\$ 38
Morgan	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 15
Polk	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 18
Putnam	3	7,585,000	5.6%	4.0%	\$ 120
Roane	1	1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 19
Robertson	1	200,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 4
Rutherford	2	880,000	0.6%	0.0%	\$ 5
Scott	1	300,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 14
Shelby	8	55,132,000	40.7%	97.4%	\$ 62
Smith	3	450,000	0.3%	100.0%	\$ 25
Sullivan	1	140,000	0.1%	0.0%	\$ 1
Sumner	1	500,000	0.4%	0.0%	\$ 4
Union	1	250,000	0.2%	0.0%	\$ 14
Van Buren	1	250,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 46
Warren	1	150,000	0.1%	100.0%	\$ 4
Wayne	1	2,000,000	1.5%	0.0%	\$ 119
White	2	300,000	0.2%	100.0%	\$ 13
Wilson	1	1,000,000	0.7%	0.0%	\$ 11
Statewide	71	\$ 135,574,000	100.0%	55.6%	\$ 24

^{*} Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

^{**}Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.

Appendix D: Reported Infrastructure Needs by County

Table D-15b. Public Health Facility Projects by County and by Stage of Development Number and Estimated Cost—Five-year Period July 2002 through June 2007*

	Conceptual					Plannin	g & Desig	n	Construction				
County	Nu	ımber		millions]	Nu	ımber		millions]	Nui	mber	Cost [in i	millions]	
Anderson	0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	1	100.0%			0	0.0%	\$ 0	0.0%	
Bledsoe	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Cannon	1	50.0%	0.2	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0.1	28.6%	
Chester	1	100.0%	1.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Claiborne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	6.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Coffee	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	
Cumberland	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Davidson	4	40.0%	1.3	31.8%	4	40.0%	1.6	40.3%	2	20.0%	1.1	27.8%	
Greene	3	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Grundy	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hamilton	1	100.0%	0.7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hancock	1	100.0%	5.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hardin	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Henderson	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Hickman	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Knox	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lauderdale	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Lewis	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.4	100.0%	
Lincoln	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	18.0	100.0%	
Loudon	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Madison	1	50.0%	2.4	19.4%	1	50.0%	10.0	80.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Maury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Monroe	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Montgomery	1	33.3%	0.2	4.3%	1	33.3%	4.3	83.3%	1	33.3%	0.6	12.4%	
Morgan	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Polk	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Putnam	3	100.0%	7.6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Roane	1	100.0%	1.0		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Robertson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Rutherford	2	100.0%	0.9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Scott	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Shelby	2	25.0%	1.5	2.7%	4	50.0%	3.6	6.6%	2	25.0%	50.0	90.7%	

Table D-15b. (continued)

	Conceptual					Plannin	g & Desig	n	Construction				
County	Number		Cost [in millions]		Number		Cost [in millions]		Number		Cost [in	millions]	
Smith	2	66.7%	0.3	66.7%	1	33.3%	0.2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sullivan	1	100.0%	0.1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Sumner	1	100.0%	0.5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Union	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Van Buren	1	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Warren	1	100.0%	0.2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wayne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
White	2	100.0%	0.3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Wilson	1	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Statewide	41	57.7%	\$ 29.7	21.9%	21	29.6%	\$ 35.2	26.0%	9	12.7%	\$ 70.6	52.1%	

^{*} Only those counties that reported projects in this category are shown.